

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This letter is responsive to the Office Action dated November 7, 2002.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged the applicant's claim for convention priority. The Examiner noted that the applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Canadian application. The applicant attaches hereto a certified copy of Canadian Patent Application No. 2,339,514 which was filed on March 6, 2001 and from which priority is claimed. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the claim for convention priority has now been completed.

In the detailed action, the Examiner noted that the application had been filed with informal drawings. In response to the drawing objections, the applicant attaches hereto a revised set of formal drawings. The margins on Figures 2 – 4, 6 and 14 have been corrected. In addition, formal drawings of Figures 8 – 18 have been provided. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the drawings are now in compliance with the rules.

In paragraph 4 of the detailed action, the Examiner stated that the application contains claims directed to five patentably distinct species. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121, applicant was requested to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

By this Response, applicant elects to proceed with species (B) (i.e. that represented by Figure 12). The Examiner is advised that claims 1 – 4, 6 – 8, 11 – 13, 17 – 19, 22, 25 – 28, 35, 36, 49 and 50 read on this species.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Bereskin & Parr

By  Philip C. Mendes da Costa

Registration No. 33,106
(416) 957-1695